

The University of Chicago

CURRENT POLITICAL
SCIENCE PUBLICATIONS IN FIVE
CHICAGO LIBRARIES

A STUDY OF COVERAGE, DUPLICATION
AND OMISSION

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE LIBRARY
SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1944

By
ANDREW J. EATON

Reprinted from
THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY
Vol. XV, July, 1945



The University of Chicago

CURRENT POLITICAL
SCIENCE PUBLICATIONS IN FIVE
CHICAGO LIBRARIES

A STUDY OF COVERAGE, DUPLICATION
AND OMISSION

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE LIBRARY
SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1944

By
ANDREW J. EATON

Reprinted from
THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY
Vol. XV, July, 1945

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CURRENT POLITICAL
SCIENCE PUBLICATIONS IN FIVE
CHICAGO LIBRARIES

A LIBRARY OF CURRENT POLITICAL
AND ECONOMIC

A PART OF THE LIBRARY IS PRINTED TO
THE ORDER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
AND IS PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY
OF CHICAGO PRESS



ANDREW J. KAPLAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Volume XV

JULY 1945

Number 3

CURRENT POLITICAL SCIENCE PUBLICATIONS IN FIVE CHICAGO LIBRARIES: A STUDY OF COVERAGE, DUPLICATION, AND OMISSION¹

ANDREW J. EATON

I. INTRODUCTION

INTERLIBRARY co-operation as a means of improving library resources and service has long been a topic of professional discussion. One form of co-operation which has frequently been mentioned as an important element in any broad co-operative program is the coordinated acquisition of library materials. This idea of co-operative book selection, to be achieved through agreements as to specialization and division of fields of responsibility, has stimulated serious discussion, especially within the past few years.²

In spite of the theoretical appeal of some form of co-operative book selection,

¹ The essential portion of a dissertation submitted to the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago in September, 1944, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

² Robert B. Downs (ed.), *Library Specialization: Proceedings of an Informal Conference Called by the A.L.A. Board on Resources of American Libraries, May 13-14, 1941* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1941), pp. 18-23; Keyes D. Metcalf and Edwin E. Williams, "Proposal for a Division of Responsibility among American Libraries in the Acquisition and Recording of Library Materials," *College and Research Libraries*, V (March, 1944), 105-9.

relatively few agreements for specialization have been made by American libraries. Existing agreements, moreover, have often proved disappointing or, at best, only partially satisfactory. Some have been tentative, stopping short of direct action; others have been so limited in scope that they have left major areas of knowledge untouched; and some which have been boldly comprehensive have been too vague and sweeping to serve as a guide to book selection in minor subject fields. Moreover, it is probably safe to say that few libraries which have entered into agreements have made provision for keeping these agreements alive and flexible by periodic scrutiny of their book-selection policies and objectives and by frequent consultation on the purchase of specific titles. These shortcomings, and the fact that so few agreements have been made, attest the complexity of the problem and the difficulties in the way of a satisfactory solution.

The agreement among Chicago's large public libraries is one of the oldest and most important examples of co-operative specialization in American library

history.³ Initiated in 1895, it provided for the division of subject fields and service among the Newberry, Crerar, and Chicago Public libraries in a manner that has clarified the objectives of each and improved their combined usefulness to readers. But, important as it has been, this agreement has fallen far short of fully co-ordinating the collection of printed materials in the Chicago area. The reasons for this are obvious. First of all, it concerns only three of the major libraries in the area, omitting such important institutions as the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. These other libraries have taken cognizance of the agreement, to be sure; but they have never formally defined their relationships to the three public libraries in terms sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for a thoroughgoing program of co-ordinated acquisition. Second, while the agreement is comprehensive in its reference to broad subject areas, such as the humanities and the natural, physical, and social sciences, it is indefinite with respect to many minor fields within these areas. And, finally, no provision has been made for the continual re-examination of acquisition policies and the day-to-day consultation on specific purchases which are necessary to keep an agreement alive.

Thus, while Chicago's major libraries have laid the groundwork for a broad program of co-ordinated acquisition, much remains to be done before this program can be completely effective. As the situation now stands, the libraries of the area would profit by a fuller knowledge of their existing holdings. Such knowledge would show what past efforts at co-ordination have accomplished and would

indicate the direction which future efforts might take. At present surprisingly little is known in detail about the combined holdings of Chicago libraries. No comprehensive survey of local collections has ever been undertaken.⁴ No attempt has been made to measure the results of past efforts at co-ordination by studies of the distribution of materials in the local libraries or of the extent of coverage in fields affected by division of responsibility. At present no librarian can say with certainty how well the libraries of the area are succeeding in making available the mass of important materials published in this country and abroad. Likewise, no detailed evidence is available of the extent of duplication or of the number of serious gaps in the combined local collections. In the absence of valid evidence, there is ground for the conjecture that Chicago libraries, taken as a group, in spite of their agreements as to fields of responsibility, are failing to acquire a large share of the output of important publications.

It is the purpose of this study to determine the extent to which Chicago's major libraries acquired one year's output of the regular book-trade publications of five countries in one important subject field (political science) and to describe how titles acquired by these libraries are distributed among them. Focusing attention on the libraries as a group, the study attempts, by the use of a check list of current publications, to view their acquisitions against the background of what was available for them to buy—the mass of books published in the selected field. For purposes of closer

³ This agreement is summarized in Carleton B. Joeckel and Leon Carnovsky, *A Metropolitan Library in Action* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. 392.

⁴ Cf. Robert B. Downs (ed.), *Resources of New York City Libraries* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1942); Bibliographical Planning Committee of Philadelphia, *Philadelphia Libraries: A Survey of Facilities, Needs, and Opportunities* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942).

analysis, titles are classified by type or form, by country of publication, and by minor subject. Thus, it becomes possible to describe the extent and character of duplication, uniqueness, and omission in terms of each of these characteristics.

Such a study, it is assumed, will supply information of a sort which will be useful in evaluating local efforts at co-operation. By showing what books the libraries, individually and collectively, are actually acquiring and, equally important, what books they are failing to acquire, it is hoped that various problems of book selection will be clarified and that both the possibilities and the difficulties of co-operation will emerge in realistic terms.

II. SCOPE AND PROCEDURE

Certain important limitations in the scope of the study should be stated at the outset. First, the study is concerned with current library acquisitions in only one major field—political science. Other fields of equal interest were considered for inclusion, but the amount of bibliographical checking involved in dealing with large numbers of titles precluded the use of more than one subject area in the investigation. The field of political science, broadly interpreted to include such topics as international relations, constitutional history, and current political problems, is an area in which a large number and variety of books are published annually and one in which all the major Chicago libraries have some interest.

Within the broad field of political science, certain limitations have been placed upon the type of material included in the check list. Publications available in the regular book trade make up the bulk of the titles. Classified by type, these fall into several fairly well-

defined groups, of which monographs, popularizations, textbooks, and reference books are the most numerous. Such publications, of course, do not include all kinds of material in the field. Other important types, such as public documents, journals, society publications, reports of organizations and institutions, manuscripts, and pamphlets, are not considered here. Thus, the present study will not present a complete picture of local library acquisitions in political science. Some libraries, in fact, which collect relatively few trade books in the field may have strong holdings of documents or serials.⁵ No library, however, which is seriously interested in the field can afford to neglect the current output of regular book-trade publications.

With respect to such publications, however, the list is comprehensive rather than selective. Comprising 1,338 publications, it includes not only the important or scholarly books but nearly all books published in the field.⁶ For this inclusiveness there are two reasons. First, it was considered desirable to discover what books the libraries are acquiring, regardless of their importance. The fact that a particular library buys popular or relatively unimportant books may be of considerable significance in planning a program of co-ordinated acquisition. Only a picture of *total* holdings can show relative emphasis in book-selection policy. More important, however, in the decision to compile a comprehensive list is the difficulty of deciding a priori what the "best" books are. Book reviews offer a rough index of the importance of books, and they were used in the present study

⁵ Library holdings of serials are determinable from Winifred Gregory (ed.), *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada* (2d ed.; New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1943).

⁶ This check list is included in the complete report of this investigation.

to distinguish roughly between the "important" and "unimportant" titles. This was done, however, *after* the list was compiled. In assembling the titles no questions of quality were raised; a formal relevance to the subject was the only criterion employed. The final list, therefore, includes the excellent and the mediocre, the scholarly and the popular; it includes some titles which almost all libraries would want and some which perhaps no library need acquire.

A further limitation concerns the date of publication of titles in the check list. All books included in the list were published during one year—1937. The choice of this particular year was dictated by several factors. The year selected should be sufficiently recent to yield findings descriptive of contemporary conditions. But it must not be so recent that the journals and bibliographies do not list the books or that the libraries have not had time to acquire them. Moreover, the year chosen should not be abnormal with respect either to the output of books or to the buying policies of libraries. The year 1937, so far as could be determined, fulfils these conditions.

To confine the study within workable proportions, it was also considered necessary to limit the check list to books published in five major countries. The countries chosen are the United States, England, France, Germany, and Italy. While emphasizing somewhat different areas of the general field, each of these countries publishes annually a considerable number of political science titles. The best of the foreign-language books are presumably of interest to scholars, if not to general readers, in the United States. Other countries of publication, of course, might have been included. But these five were probably the most important sources of books acquired by American libraries in 1937.

The libraries whose holdings are analyzed in this study are the largest and most important collections in the Chicago area: the John Crerar Library, the Newberry Library, the Chicago Public Library, and the libraries of Northwestern University and of the University of Chicago. The New York Public Library is included for purposes of comparison. Other Chicago libraries specializing in political science, such as the Joint Reference Library of the Public Administration Clearing House and the Library of International Relations, might well have been considered in the study. But the five chosen are clearly the major collections in the field.

Of the Chicago libraries, two are great special libraries whose interest in political science is definitely secondary, though not unimportant. The Newberry Library includes political science among its fields of specialization but attempts to acquire only "substantial works of a general character."⁷ It collects extensively in the field of history (including political and constitutional history, which are represented in the present check list) and to some extent in international law. The John Crerar Library, according to the agreement of 1895, accepts responsibility for the whole field of the social sciences.⁸ Just what areas of the field and what types of material are emphasized are not clear, but it is assumed that the library has devoted some attention to social science materials (including political science), even though its major efforts have been concentrated on the natural and physical sciences. It has also been interested at one time or another in constitutional and international law.

⁷ Newberry Library, *Handbook of the Newberry Library* (Chicago: Newberry Library, 1933), pp. 7-11.

⁸ John Crerar Library, *Handbook, 1929* (Chicago: Printed by Order of the Board of Directors, 1929), p. 8.

Two of the libraries included serve important educational institutions sponsoring broad programs of instruction and research in political science. At both the University of Chicago and Northwestern University political science is among the strongest departments; both schools offer work in almost all areas of the field at the graduate as well as the undergraduate level. Both institutions also emphasize the fields of history, international relations, and law, all of which are represented in the check list used in the present study. Both of these libraries, therefore, are presumably committed to a policy of extensive acquisition of political science materials.

The Chicago Public Library attempts to meet the needs of general readers in all fields. While it is relieved of the necessity of acquiring specialized materials in areas covered by Newberry and John Crerar, it is responsible for providing circulating copies of many books which are already in the two reference libraries. To this library political science is merely one of many fields to which it devotes approximately equal attention.

The New York Public Library is a large, scholarly library which provides some materials in almost all fields.⁹ In certain areas of specialization, however, it collects extensively for research purposes as well as for general reading. Political science is one of these fields. Here the library attempts to acquire "nearly everything of consequence" published in the United States (except textbooks) and somewhat less of the English and continental-European materials. It is also strong in history and international law.¹⁰

While the New York Public Library has a well-deserved reputation for the scope and richness of its collections, it should be emphasized that this library is not included here as a model for the Chicago libraries. Every individual library and every great library center have their peculiar needs and interests which should determine the nature of their objectives and their book collections. What is essential for one library may be inappropriate for another. It is not assumed, therefore, that all books held by the New York Public Library should necessarily be represented in the Chicago area. The holdings of this library are presented here merely to show what one great scholarly library acquired in a major area of specialization. It may be assumed, however, that most of the books obtained by such a library have some interest for serious readers.

As stated above, the study focuses attention on the Chicago libraries as a group and attempts to show, in terms of books acquired, what their combined efforts are achieving in building up the book resources of the community as a whole. In doing this, of course, it is necessary to determine what books *each* library is acquiring. This information reveals differences in the strength of the various libraries and leads to distinctions between relatively strong and weak collections in the field. Such distinctions are useful, but they should be interpreted with caution. In the first place, they must not be made without reference to the objectives of the libraries concerned. A library cannot be expected to have extensive collections in a field in which it has only a marginal interest. Second, distinctions between "strong" and "weak" libraries may be made here only

⁹ Only the Reference Department of the New York Public Library is considered in this study. For the book-selection policy of this library see R. A. Sawyer, "Book Selection in the Reference Department of the New York Public Library," *College and Research Libraries*, VI (December, 1944), 20-22.

¹⁰ New York Public Library, *A Guide to the Reference Collections . . .*, compiled by Karl Brown (New York: New York Public Library, 1941), p. 146.

with respect to holdings of the type of material included in this study, namely, current publications in the book trade. For, as mentioned above, there are several other types of material which a truly strong library in the field must acquire. A library which has a large share of the books in the present check list might be relatively weak in its holdings of serials, documents, reports, and ephemeral materials.

To clarify the purpose and scope of the study, certain assumptions should be made explicit. First, it is not assumed that each of the libraries should hold all the titles in the check list, or any particular proportion of them; the book collections of each library are determined by its specific objectives. Since the objectives of these libraries vary, their holdings may be expected to vary accordingly. Thus, the check list is not an instrument of direct evaluation to be applied to libraries of differing purposes.

This study does assume, however, that the Chicago area—the fourth largest library center in the country—should approach completeness in its stock of important current publications which might be of interest either to the scholar or to the general reader. It assumes, further, that the distribution of holdings among the major libraries should exhibit some rational pattern corresponding to a working plan of division of responsibility. Extensive coverage, in other words, is a desirable goal, and some degree of systematic co-operation is essential to its realization. Finally, the study assumes that the local libraries are genuinely interested in co-operation as a means of reducing duplication and increasing coverage. Without such interest and without a willingness to reconcile the objectives of individual libraries with the needs of the community as a

whole, no effective scheme of co-ordinated book acquisition is possible.

The procedure followed in the study involved five major steps: (1) compiling the check list of current political science books published during 1937, (2) classifying the titles, (3) evaluating the titles, (4) searching the titles in the catalogs of the libraries, and (5) analyzing and interpreting the pattern of library holdings.

Titles included in the list were taken chiefly from two types of sources: scholarly book-reviewing journals and national bibliographies. The scholarly journals used were carefully selected to include those giving most attention to current books in the field. Five or six journals were chosen from each of the five countries of publication included in the study. All books mentioned in the journals, whether reviewed or merely listed, were considered for inclusion in the list. Next, the various national bibliographies such as the *Cumulative Book Index* and the *Deutsche Nationalbibliographie*, were searched under subject headings relevant to political science. This approach supplied many titles which had not been found in the journals. A few other sources such as the *Bibliographie der Staats- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften* and *Books Abroad*, were checked in an effort to make the list as comprehensive as possible; these sources, however, yielded relatively few new titles. In checking the journals, it was usually necessary to search the volumes covering the years 1937-40 to be sure of finding all references to 1937 imprints. For the national bibliographies, it was not found necessary to go beyond the 1937 and 1938 volumes.

The major difficulties encountered in compiling the list arose from two factors: (1) the lack of clearly defined boundaries in the field of political science and (2)

the lack of detailed information about many of the books considered for inclusion. There is no agreement as to the scope of the field of political science. For purposes of the present study, it was thought advisable to accept arbitrarily that definition of the subject expressed in the Library of Congress Classification (Schedule J), which, though badly out of date, supplies a systematic and detailed analysis of the field.¹¹ Elaborate as it is, however, this scheme is often far from clear, particularly in those borderline areas where political science merges into history, philosophy, law, etc. These ambiguities in the classification scheme frequently complicated the problem of deciding whether or not to include a particular title.

The lack of adequate information about many books also impeded the compilation of the list. Titles listed in the national bibliographies and many of those mentioned in the journals appeared without descriptive notes. Frequently neither the title nor the subject entry provided a clear idea of the contents of the book. In such cases, the book was often included for future consideration on the basis of further information obtained from book reviews or library catalogs.

Once the list was compiled, the books were classified for purposes of detailed analysis. Three bases of classification were used: (1) subject, (2) type, and (3) country of publication.

The Library of Congress Schedule J, accepted as a basic outline of political science for purposes of this study, divides the field into ten broad areas. These areas, which provide the framework for

the analysis of library holdings by subject, are as follows:

- JA General Works in Political Science
Includes histories of political science
- JC Political Theory
- JF Constitutional History and Administration
—General and Comparative
Includes general materials on the organs and functions of government, political rights and guarantees, administration, political parties and practical politics
- JK Constitutional History and Administration—United States
The major subclasses are (a) constitutional history, (b) government and administration, (c) civil and political rights, and (d) political parties¹²
- JL Constitutional History and Administration—British America and Latin America
- JN Constitutional History and Administration—Europe
- JQ Constitutional History and Administration—Asia, Africa, Australia, Oceania
- JS Local Government
- JV Colonies and Colonization
Includes emigration and immigration
Books on specific colonies are classed elsewhere
- JX International Law, Foreign Relations, Diplomacy, International Arbitration

With this outline of the field, the problem of classifying the books by subject was largely solved by using Library of Congress Classification numbers. These numbers were copied whenever they were found in the process of checking the library catalogs. For many titles, however, no numbers were available. Some books on the list—such as those in law—have not yet been classified by libraries using the Library of Congress scheme. Other titles were found which were classified only according to local schemes. (Of the libraries searched, only the University of Chicago uses the Library of Congress system.) Still other publications have not been acquired by any of the libraries. To all these unclassified

¹¹ U.S. Library of Congress, Classification Division, *Classification: Class J, Political Science* (2d ed.; Washington: Government Printing Office, 1924).

¹² These same subdivisions appear also under classes JL, JN, and JQ.

books the writer assigned Library of Congress class numbers, attempting to classify each title as precisely as possible with the information at hand. For many of the titles reviews were found which supplied needed information.

After the books were classified by subject, it was found that about half of the titles on the list fell outside the limits of political science as defined by Schedule J. These books were classed chiefly in history (Schedules D, E, and F) and the social sciences (Schedule H). Since many of them were obviously of no less interest to the political scientist than the books which happened to fall in Schedule J, it was decided to retain them as books in related fields. These titles, therefore, were grouped in eight broad subject categories and added to the basic list of titles classified in Schedule J. The eight categories of related books are as follows:

1. International Relations
Includes books on relations between two or more countries, both current and historical; this group may be thought of in connection with the subclass JX (International Law, etc.) in Schedule J
2. Political History
Especially of single countries
3. Contemporary Political Problems
Primarily domestic rather than international
4. Colonies and Colonial Problems
Includes books on particular colonies; this group is closely related to subclass JV in Schedule J
5. Political Biography
6. Law—Legal and Administrative Problems
Includes books on aspects of law which are relevant to political science as defined in this study, e.g., public law, administrative law, maritime law, etc.
7. Church and State
8. Economic and Social Problems (History, Theory, and Present Conditions)
Includes a relatively small group of titles selected for their relevance to the field of political science

While the "related" titles constitute an important part of the list, it should be noted that they differ in one respect from the books in political science proper. This difference lies in the fact that they do not necessarily constitute a comprehensive collection of materials published in the fields which they represent. The books in the area of law, for example, are by no means a complete collection of all those published in that category during the year. They are merely those titles which seemed most relevant to the field of political science as defined in this study.

Moreover, it should be emphasized that not all the fields related to political science are represented by the titles in these eight categories. Broadly speaking, political science depends upon all the other social sciences. Traditionally, it is related most closely to history and economics, but it also draws upon sociology, anthropology, psychology, geography, law, and the like. Most of these fields are not covered in the present study. Only history and law are represented by more than a handful of titles. Economics and finance, both of which are closely related to politics, are almost entirely neglected here.

The eighteen subject groups described above—ten in political science proper and eight in related fields—thus serve as the basis for the analysis of library holdings by subject. By classifying the holdings in terms of these subdivisions, it is possible to determine areas of strength and weakness in the library collections.

For purposes of distinguishing between various types or forms of current publications, a type classification scheme was developed. The scheme consists of six categories: (1) monograph, (2) popularization, (3) textbook, (4) general

treatise, (5) collection, and (6) reference work. These categories are familiar to librarians and students in all fields. So far as the present writer is aware, however, no previous attempt has been made to define them precisely or to employ them systematically in classifying a large number of books. Defined in terms of such characteristics as scope of subject matter, treatment, purpose, appeal, and the like, the six categories are as follows:

MONOGRAPH

Subject and scope.—Deals with a limited, specialized subject. Subject is usually one which is appropriate for serious study or investigation and sufficiently limited in scope to make thorough treatment possible; rarely is it of a "popular" nature.

Treatment.—Usually detailed and scholarly; characterized by careful research, extensive documentation, detailed analysis of evidence, etc. May be long or short.

Purpose.—To contribute to the understanding of some hitherto unexplored problem. In its presentation of new facts or theories a monograph usually represents an original contribution to its subject.

Appeal.—Primarily to the scholar or subject specialist.

Other features.—Frequently takes the form of a doctoral dissertation. Rarely appears in more than one edition.

Examples: KEY, V. O. *The Administration of Federal Grants to States*. Pp. 388. PERKINS, D. *The Monroe Doctrine, 1867-1907*. Pp. 480. SCHMITT, B. *The Annexation of Bosnia, 1908-1909*. Pp. 264.

POPULARIZATION

Subject and scope.—Deals with a subject of general or current interest. Subject is usually broad in scope.

Treatment.—Emphasizes reader appeal in approach, style, vocabulary, etc. Usually not detailed or technical. Popularizations vary widely in the quality of their treatment. They range from collections of authors' personal prejudices to authentic narratives based on careful research, judicious selection, and skilful synthesis of materials. A good popularization may bring together relevant facts culled from hundreds of

special books and weave them into a readable volume which will appeal to the layman.

Purpose.—To inform or influence the general reader. A popularization is usually a collection of existing information rather than an original contribution.

Appeal.—To the general reader or layman.

Examples: HOOVER, C. B. *Dictators and Democracies*. Pp. 110. LEIGHTON, J. A. *Social Philosophies in Conflict*. Pp. 546. LIPPMANN, W. *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Good Society*. Pp. 402.

TEXTBOOK

Subject and scope.—Deals with a relatively broad subject. Subject is usually one which corresponds to some area of the school or college curriculum.

Treatment.—Systematic. Varies according to the level of instruction for which it is intended. Emphasizes basic facts and fundamental principles. May be long, but is generally not as exhaustive as a treatise. Usually contains reading lists, exercises, or other features for classroom use.

Purpose.—To supply a manual or introductory treatment of a subject for instructional purposes or for convenient reference. A textbook is usually a collection of existing information in convenient form rather than an original contribution.

Appeal.—To students and beginners in a subject.

Other features.—Textbooks are frequently published by certain firms which specialize in educational materials. Revised editions are common.

Examples: LEWIS, E. *A History of American Political Thought from the Civil War to the World War*. Pp. 561. DIMOCK, M. *Modern Politics and Administration*. Pp. 440. GOOCH, R. *The Government of England*. Pp. 326.

Subcategories.—Include in this category other types of books intended primarily for the use of students; e.g., casebooks, collections of readings in a subject, debate handbooks, outlines.

GENERAL TREATISE

Subject and scope.—Deals with a relatively broad subject. Subject is usually an important field of knowledge in which specialized research has been going on for a length of time sufficient to permit the formulation of principles and generalizations.

Treatment.—Systematic. Discusses the subject as a whole, in all its parts, with emphasis on general principles. Usually exhaustive.

Purpose.—To present systematically the facts and general principles, so far as they are known, in a major area of human knowledge. In its synthesis and its formulation of principles a treatise is usually an original contribution and a monumental work in its field.

Appeal.—To students and specialists in the field.

Other features.—Authors are frequently mature scholars or experienced practitioners in the field. Titles often appear in successive editions. A small category numerically; relatively few titles of this type are published in any one year.

Examples: BUSTAMANTE, A. *Droit international public*, Vol. IV. Pp. 618. OPPENHEIM, L. *International Law*, Vol. I (5th ed.). Pp. 819.

REFERENCE WORK

Form.—An alphabetic or systematic subdivision of the material is a distinctive feature of this category. Other characteristics are of minor importance for purposes of classification by type. All the familiar varieties of reference books may be grouped in this category; e.g., dictionaries, encyclopedias, yearbooks, bibliographies, collections of documents, and the like.

Examples: ACADEMIE DIPLOMATIQUE INTERNATIONALE. *Dictionnaire diplomatique*. Pp. 1108. STEPHENSON, C. (ed.). *Sources of English Constitutional History*. Pp. 940. *Organisationsbuch der NSDAP*. Pp. 556.

Subcategories.—Include also the following types of material which are intended primarily for reference use: laws (texts, codes, commentaries), charters, court decisions, collections of treaties, diplomatic correspondence, parliamentary debates, administrative regulations, manuals for the use of government officials.

COLLECTIONS

Subject and scope.—Deals with a fairly broad subject. Includes essays, lectures, and miscellaneous collections. Subject is usually of a technical or specialized nature; popular materials of this type are considered "popularizations."

Treatment.—Scholarly. Discursive rather than thorough or systematic.

Purpose.—To bring together new facts or viewpoints bearing on a particular field or problem

Appeal.—To the scholar or subject specialist.

Examples: FORTI, U. *Studi di diritto pubblico*. 2 vols. GOODHART, A. *Essays in Jurisprudence and the Common Law*. Pp. 295. GULICK, L., et al. *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Pp. 195. HAGUE. ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW. *Recueil de cours*, 1936. 3 vols. *L'Opera dei delegati italiani nella Societa delle Nazioni*. 4 vols. NORTH CAROLINA. GOVERNOR. *Public Papers and Letters of Oliver Max Gardner*. Pp. 788.

From the above outline, it is clear that the scheme provides reasonably well for most types of current book-trade publications. The "Textbook" and "General Treatise" groups accommodate the systematic studies, including new editions of standard works. The categories devoted to "Monographs" and "Collections" provide for the serious and relatively specialized studies which are addressed primarily to scholars. The "Popularization" category, on the other hand, accommodates a wide variety of books written for the general reader. It includes popular histories and biographies, books of description, books on contemporary problems, and expressions of current opinion. Some of these are books of lasting value; others are merely current journalism which are of permanent use only as they serve to document contemporary issues. The "Reference Work" category, finally, provides for all materials which are designed primarily for reference use.

On paper the six categories appear reasonably definite and discrete. Moreover, in the process of classifying the present list of titles it was found that a large majority of the books fitted easily into the scheme. Many could be classified accurately without any more information than appears on a Library of Congress card, but others had to be examined before they could be classified. Difficulties arose in many cases because of a lack of information about the titles, but here it was often possible to consult

book reviews for the essential facts. Some titles, however, did not fit readily into any one of the categories. These were borderline cases which often possessed some characteristics of several of the type categories without having all the characteristics of any one of them. In such cases an arbitrary decision was the only solution.

Country of publication was the final basis used in classifying the titles in the list. Since the place of publication was available for almost all the books, this classification involved no difficulties. The one problem encountered was that of distinguishing between English and American books. Many titles were published simultaneously in both countries or were distributed by firms having outlets in both countries. In such cases it was frequently impossible to tell which was the original country of publication. This fact could undoubtedly have been ascertained by searching bibliographies and publishers' catalogs, but it was not considered necessary, for purposes of this study, to determine the country to which every English-language title really belongs. For present purposes, the fact that a particular book is or is not acquired is the crucial matter; whether an English or an American edition is acquired is not important, provided the two are essentially similar. Therefore, the place of publication as given in the journals and bibliographies used as sources of titles was accepted without further investigation.

The question of differences in the quality or importance of the books was the next problem considered. It has been mentioned above that, in compiling the present list, no attempt was made to select only the "best" books. If a book appeared to be relevant to the subject, it was included. The question of quality,

however, could not well be ignored completely. Libraries are interested primarily in the "important" books, and any study such as this should attempt to determine whether or not they are acquiring them. But what were the "important" books published in the field of political science in 1937? To distinguish these titles from the mass of publications requires some criterion that is both valid and practicable. To find such a criterion, one must first answer the questions, "Important for whom?" and "Important for what purpose?" But these questions are not easily answered. To say that those books are important which are of use to scholars is hardly satisfactory. For the needs of scholars are both ill defined and unpredictable; and scholars are but one group of library users. Moreover, it cannot be maintained that only "contributions to scholarship" are important, for even scholars frequently depend upon popular books to document current problems. The problem is further complicated by the fact that books vary in their "importance" to different libraries. Textbooks and dissertations, for example, are more important to academic libraries than they are to popular libraries. Thus, the "importance" of books is not easily determined.

In the absence of any absolute criterion, book reviews seemed to offer a workable method of distinguishing between the "important" and the "unimportant" titles in the present list. As used here, this method involves two assumptions. It assumes, first, that *all* the "important" books are reviewed. Second, it assumes that any book reviewed is important, since no attempt was made to differentiate between favorable and unfavorable reviews. Anyone familiar with reviewing journals knows that these assumptions are not entirely valid. The

editors of the various journals select books for review from among those sent by the publishers for this purpose. Under such a system, it must frequently happen that important books are not sent to all journals, or, if sent, are not reviewed. And it must also happen that many relatively unimportant books are sent, some of which are reviewed. Yet, in spite of these facts, reviews may be accepted as a rough measure of importance in dealing with a large number of titles. For while there will be some obvious errors, and while no one will agree with every decision, it is undoubtedly true that, by and large, the reviewed titles are the more important publications in any field.

In an effort to determine whether or not the titles in the present list were reviewed, two sources were relied upon: (1) *Bibliographie der Rezensionen*¹³ and (2) selected journals in the field of political science. The former is by far the most comprehensive index of book reviews available. It indexes reviews appearing in a large number of general and specialized journals, both German and non-German. Unfortunately, however, it does not always include all reviews in the journals indexed. Therefore, it was necessary to refer to the journals themselves in an effort to determine conclusively whether or not titles had been reviewed. A selection was made of the outstanding political science journals published in the United States, England, France, Germany, and Italy, and these were checked carefully for reviews of titles not found in *Bibliographie der Rezensionen*.¹⁴ Together these two sources were undoubtedly adequate for determining whether or not the great major-

ity of the titles were reviewed. A few more reviews might have been discovered by searching journals in fields related to political science, but this was considered unnecessary in view of the comprehensive character of *Bibliographie der Rezensionen*.

In all, reviews were found for 75 per cent of the books included in the check list. These are assumed to be the "important" titles in the analyses of library holdings which follow.

After compiling, classifying, and evaluating the check list, the next step was to determine the holdings of the libraries. The titles were searched first in the Official and Union Catalog of the University of Chicago, which contains cards representing the holdings of the University of Chicago libraries, cards contributed by such libraries as those of the University of Illinois and the University of Michigan, and the Library of Congress Depository set. Thus, while checking University of Chicago holdings, it was possible at the same time to verify entries and other bibliographical information and to secure classification numbers for many titles. The list was then checked against the catalogs of the other four Chicago libraries, including those of the Northwestern University Law and Commerce libraries, which are not represented in the main catalog at Evanston. Next, several hundred titles which were not found in any Chicago library or catalog were checked in the Library of Congress Union Catalog in an effort to verify bibliographical details and to supply classification numbers. Finally, the complete list was searched in the catalog of the New York Public Library.¹⁵

¹³ Leipzig: F. Dietrich, 1901-44.

¹⁴ The journals used as sources of reviews are listed in the complete report of this study.

¹⁵ The writer is indebted to Paul North Rice, chief of the Reference Department, for assuming complete responsibility for the checking of the New York Public Library holdings.

III. CHICAGO LIBRARY HOLDINGS

The first major question posed by this study concerns the problem of over-all library coverage. In its simplest form the question is: What proportion of the mass of current publications in the field of political science was acquired by the large libraries of the Chicago area? The answer which emerges from the present study is that slightly less than half of the books published in the field during 1937 were acquired through the combined efforts of these libraries. Of the 1,338 books in the check list, 621, or 46 per cent, were found in one or more of the Chicago libraries. The remaining 717 titles (54 per cent) were not held by any of them.

From a purely quantitative standpoint, this showing is certainly not impressive. If one assumes that the libraries were aiming at very broad coverage in the field, it is clear that their efforts were far from adequate. Just how well other library centers would do in the same field can be determined only by checking their holdings; probably none would acquire all or substantially all of the 1,338 publications. But that the New York City area would far surpass Chicago is apparent, for the New York Public Library alone acquired 67 per cent of the publications listed, or 21 per cent more than were acquired by the five Chicago libraries together.

Gross figures such as these, of course, completely ignore the question of quality. While the Chicago libraries acquired only 46 per cent of the mass of books, they may have acquired a much greater proportion of the "important" titles. In so far as reviews are a valid criterion of importance, however, the evidence does not support this conclusion. Of the 997 reviewed items, which are assumed to be the more important titles in the list,

they acquired only 53 per cent.¹⁶ This is only a slightly larger proportion than they acquired of the total list. The New York Public Library alone, on the other hand, obtained 76 per cent of the reviewed titles. These figures suggest that the Chicago libraries, as a group, are failing to secure a fairly large proportion of the worth-while current publications in political science.

Such is the picture of the libraries' holdings in broad outline. For a more detailed view it will be necessary to consider these holdings in terms of (1) countries of publication, (2) types of publication, and (3) subject areas.

Table 1 shows the number and proportion of titles published in each country which were acquired by the five libraries. Reference to this table shows at once that the libraries are by no means equally interested in the publications of all five countries. As might be expected, they obtained a relatively large share of the American publications. Books of English origin rank next in emphasis, but only 55 per cent of these were acquired. Much less interest was shown in the foreign-language titles. Of these, German titles were preferred to French, while Italian materials were comparatively neglected.

Of the current political science materials acquired by Chicago libraries, then, the great majority are books in the English language; and most of these were published in the United States. That American publications should be emphasized is not surprising, of course. But that so little attention should be given to works of foreign origin is noteworthy. Even if it is assumed that only a representative selection of such works is

¹⁶ Books found to be reviewed are so designated in the check list included in the complete report of this study.

needed in the Chicago area, it seems fair to say that this minimum requirement is not being met.

Comparison of the holdings of the Chicago libraries with those of the New York Public Library indicates that the New York City area is considerably

quired through the combined efforts of the Chicago institutions. While emphasizing books in English, the New York Public Library, unlike the Chicago libraries, did not neglect foreign-language materials.

Table 2 presents the number and per-

TABLE 1
CURRENT POLITICAL SCIENCE BOOKS ACQUIRED BY FIVE CHICAGO
LIBRARIES AND THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
BY COUNTRY OF PUBLICATION

Country of Publication	Total Books in Check List	No. Held by Chicago Libraries	No. Held by N.Y.P.L.	Per Cent Held by Chicago Libraries	Per Cent Held by N.Y.P.L.
United States.....	391	318	351	81.33	89.77
England.....	255	142	206	55.69	80.78
Germany.....	237	83	112	35.02	47.26
France.....	261	57	147	21.84	56.32
Italy.....	194	21	79	10.82	40.72

TABLE 2
CURRENT POLITICAL SCIENCE BOOKS ACQUIRED BY FIVE CHICAGO
LIBRARIES AND THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY, BY TYPE

Type of Publication	Total Books in Check List	No. Held by Chicago Libraries	No. Held by N.Y.P.L.	Per Cent Held by Chicago Libraries	Per Cent Held by N.Y.P.L.
General Treatise...	11	7	7	63.64	63.64
Collection.....	56	31	43	55.36	76.79
Monograph.....	457	219	292	47.92	63.89
Textbook.....	165	78	71	47.27	43.03
Popularization....	550	244	436	44.36	79.27
Reference Work....	99	42	46	42.42	46.46

better equipped with foreign-language materials. Table 1 shows that the New York Public Library alone acquired a far larger proportion of the foreign-language works than was acquired by all five Chicago libraries together. Specifically, this library obtained 12 per cent more of the German, 34 per cent more of the French, and 30 per cent more of the Italian publications than were ac-

centage of titles of each type acquired through the combined efforts of the five Chicago libraries. The first impression conveyed by these figures is that, in relation to the titles available in each category, the Chicago libraries did not obtain a large share of the books in any of the six types of publication. Their largest holdings, proportionately, were in the "General Treatise" category, where

they acquired 64 per cent of the items available. But considering the size of the category—only eleven books of this type are listed—and the nature of the titles, this is certainly not high. The "Collection" category, in which 55 per cent of the books are held, is likewise a small group. In each of the larger categories, fewer than half of the available titles were acquired.

While the extent of coverage is relatively limited in all categories, it is also noteworthy that the Chicago libraries gave almost equal emphasis to the four largest groups. While they were most interested, relatively, in "General Treatises" and "Collections," they showed no strong preference for any of the other four categories. The "Popularization," "Monograph," "Textbook," and "Reference Work" groups were given roughly equal attention in proportion to the number of titles contained in each.

In view of the nature and objectives of the Chicago libraries, the emphasis placed upon the different types of publication is somewhat surprising. Of these five libraries, four are interested primarily in serving students and research workers. One would expect such libraries as a group to show a relatively great interest in such scholarly materials as monographs, collections, general treatises, and reference books, somewhat less interest in textbooks, and relatively little interest in popularizations. Yet, as Table 2 shows, these libraries emphasized popularizations and textbooks to roughly the same extent as monographs and reference books. This is not to say, of course, that the popularizations and textbooks acquired are not valuable and useful books; perhaps all of them are. It is the amount of emphasis given to these materials that is of interest here.

To turn to the holdings of the New

York Public Library for comparison, it is evident that this library acquired a relatively large share of the books in several of the type groups. While the Chicago libraries secured as many as 64 per cent of the titles in only one category, the New York Public Library obtained 64 per cent or more in four categories. In two of the groups it acquired more than 75 per cent of the available publications. With respect to coverage, therefore, this library shows up fairly well in all but two type categories.

Like the Chicago libraries, the New York Public Library emphasized the "General Treatise" and "Collection" groups. But, unlike them, it showed a strong interest in the "Popularization" and "Monograph" categories as well. In these two categories the New York Public Library acquired 35 per cent and 16 per cent more titles, respectively, than the five Chicago libraries acquired together. Less attention was given by the New York Public Library to the "Reference Work" and "Textbook" groups. But only in the latter group did this library hold a smaller share of the titles than was held by the Chicago libraries.

This distribution of emphasis seems fairly consistent with the nature and objectives of a great general library serving both specialists and laymen. Of the books in the present list, its holdings of both scholarly and popular titles are impressively large. The library's policy of acquiring only major textbooks explains the relatively small representation of titles in this category.¹⁷

Subject matter is a third major characteristic of books which may be used to analyze library holdings of current publications. By showing to what extent various subdivisions of the field are represented by the library holdings, it will

¹⁷ New York Public Library, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

be possible to describe in another important respect what kind of political science books Chicago libraries are acquiring.

As stated above, the Library of Congress Classification Schedule J was accepted as a basic definition of the field of

group. From the figures in this table it is clear at once that the extent of coverage varies greatly from one subdivision to another. In three areas the libraries obtained more than 70 per cent of the titles available. In six areas, on the other hand, they acquired less than 40 per cent. In

TABLE 3
CURRENT POLITICAL SCIENCE BOOKS ACQUIRED BY FIVE CHICAGO
LIBRARIES AND THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY, BY SUBJECT

SUBJECT	NO. OF BOOKS IN LIST	HELD BY CHICAGO LIBRARIES		HELD BY N.Y.P.L.	
		No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
JL Constitutional History and Administration—British and Latin America. . .	2	2	100.00	2	100.00
5 Political Biography.	49	38	77.55	48	97.96
JA Political Science—General Works.	15	11	73.33	11	73.33
JK Constitutional History and Administration—United States.	81	55	67.90	63	77.78
7 Church and State.	20	12	60.00	17	85.00
1 International Relations.	181	107	59.12	148	81.77
2 Political History.	123	69	56.10	93	75.61
JF Constitutional History and Administration—General and Comparative.	21	11	52.38	15	71.43
8 Economic and Social Problems (History, Theory, and Present Conditions).	79	40	50.63	63	79.75
JX International Law, Foreign Relations, Diplomacy, International Arbitration.	182	90	49.45	108	59.34
JC Political Theory.	84	35	41.67	53	63.10
JQ Constitutional History and Administration—Asia, Africa, Australia, Oceania.	17	7	41.18	14	82.35
3 Contemporary Political Problems.	114	40	35.09	94	82.46
JS Local Government.	60	21	35.09	22	36.67
4 Colonies and Colonial Problems.	41	14	34.15	34	82.93
JV Colonies and Colonization.	62	18	29.03	34	54.84
JN Constitutional History and Administration—Europe.	153	38	24.84	57	37.25
6 Law—Legal and Administrative Problems.	54	13	24.07	19	35.19

political science. This scheme divides the field into ten subdivisions. To these were added eight broad categories to accommodate related books which were classed outside Schedule J. In all, then, eighteen subdivisions of the field are represented in this analysis.

To what extent did the Chicago libraries acquire current books in these areas of political science? Table 3 shows the number and percentage of titles obtained in each area by the libraries as a

the remaining nine areas from 41 to 68 per cent of the books were held. If one assumes that acquisition of 70 per cent or more of the books is "extensive" coverage, from 40 to 69 per cent is "moderate" coverage, and less than 40 per cent is "slight" coverage, it may be said that the Chicago holdings represent "extensive" coverage in three areas, "moderate" coverage in nine areas, and "slight" coverage in six areas of the field.

The distribution of emphasis re-

vealed by these figures suggests something of a lack of focus in the book-selection policies of the Chicago libraries as a group. For if these policies were sharply defined, one would expect that certain areas of the field would be designated as "essential" areas. In these areas a large share (possibly 75 per cent or more) of the current publications would be acquired. In other areas which were considered less important, relatively few books would be bought. In other words, there would be fewer subfields in which coverage would be "moderate" and more in which coverage would be "extensive." Under present conditions, "extensive" coverage is achieved in only two or three areas of the field, while nine areas are covered to a "moderate" extent.

From the emphasis placed upon the various subdivisions, it appears that the Chicago libraries are primarily interested in political biography, general works in political science, and the constitutional history and administration of the United States.¹⁸ Their interest is relatively slight, on the other hand, in legal materials, European constitutional history and administration, colonial questions, local government, and contemporary political problems.

What explanation can be given for these variations in interest? Logically, one would expect the subjects emphasized by a library or group of libraries to reflect the objectives of the institutions concerned. But the objectives of the Chicago libraries have never been defined in terms of minor subdivisions of subject fields. Presumably, these libraries as a group are equally interested

in all areas of political science. At least, they are sufficiently interested to collect *some* materials in each of the eighteen subdivisions. But why are they so much more interested in some areas than in others? Library objectives, as now defined, give no clear answer to this question.

To some extent, the nature of the books available in the various subject areas may explain these differences in emphasis. Biographies are materials which contribute to a variety of library interests, and they are often in popular demand. Hence, libraries might be expected to acquire a large share of them. American readers are naturally more interested in the government of the United States than in foreign governments. This probably explains the relatively strong emphasis on the JK class ("Constitutional History and Administration—United States"). Many of the books in JN ("Constitutional History and Administration—Europe"), moreover, are in foreign languages, a type of material relatively neglected by Chicago libraries. This same factor may explain the poor representation of materials in Group 6 ("Law—Legal and Administrative Problems"). While the factors mentioned may account for some of the variations in library holdings, they do not, of course, justify them. What fields the libraries should emphasize depends ultimately upon the needs of their respective clienteles.

Table 3 also presents the holdings of the New York Public Library by subject. Here the pattern of coverage is strikingly different from that of the Chicago libraries. While the latter showed "extensive" coverage in only three subject areas, the New York Public Library acquired more than 70 per cent of the books in no less than twelve subfields. In only three areas, on the other hand,

¹⁸ The fact that class JL ("Constitutional History and Administration—British America and Latin America") contains only two titles makes the holdings in this area unreliable as a gauge of library interest.

were less than 40 per cent of the books obtained.

This distribution of emphasis suggests a much clearer definition of objectives than is apparent in the combined holdings of the five Chicago libraries. In the areas in which it is primarily interested, the New York Public Library has "extensive" holdings of current materials; in other areas it buys relatively few books. The number of subfields in which only "moderate" coverage is achieved is limited to three.

Like the Chicago libraries, the New York Public Library showed relatively

TABLE 4
CURRENT POLITICAL SCIENCE BOOKS
ACQUIRED BY EACH OF FIVE
CHICAGO LIBRARIES

Library	No. of Books Acquired	Per Cent of Total Check List
University of Chicago.....	515	38.49
Northwestern University..	336	25.11
Newberry.....	206	15.40
Chicago Public.....	165	12.33
John Crerar.....	70	5.23

strong interest in political biography, general works in political science, the constitutional history and administration of the United States, and questions of church and state. Agreement is also apparent in the areas receiving least emphasis: law, European constitutional history and administration, and local government. In other subfields, however, the Chicago and New York holdings differ widely. Groups 3 ("Contemporary Political Problems") and 4 ("Colonies and Colonial Problems") were covered extensively by the New York Public Library, but the Chicago libraries gave them little attention. Apart from the preferences shown by the libraries, however, the striking fact stands out that in all but two of the

eighteen subfields the New York Public Library alone acquired a larger share of the books than was acquired by the five Chicago libraries together.

Thus far, attention has been focused upon the combined holdings of the five Chicago libraries taken as a group. This approach, which looks at library resources from the viewpoint of the community as a whole, is of primary interest in the present study. But the combined holdings of the Chicago libraries are obviously no more than the pooled acquisitions of five individual institutions. Each of these libraries, by acquiring materials to meet the needs of its particular clientele, makes a distinctive contribution to the book resources of the group. Analysis of the holdings of each library, therefore, is essential to an understanding of the strength and weakness of their combined resources.

Table 4 shows the five libraries ranked according to the number of titles held. Reference to this table shows at once that none of the libraries acquired a large share of the 1,338 check-list publications. This was to be expected, of course, from the statistics presented above, which showed that the five libraries as a group attained only moderately extensive coverage of the available titles. In view of the fact that the libraries together acquired only 46 per cent of the 1,338 check-list items, it is perhaps surprising that one library alone should have obtained as many as 38 per cent.

While the two university libraries are easily pre-eminent, it is interesting that the University of Chicago obtained a somewhat larger proportion of the titles than Northwestern. Of the three public libraries, Newberry is strongest in current materials, but its holdings exceed those of the Chicago Public by only 3 per cent. John Crerar, one must conclude

from these figures, still retains some interest in current political science publications; but, compared with the other large Chicago libraries, it has by far the weakest collection in the field.

IV. THE PATTERN OF DISTRIBUTION

Closely related to the problem of coverage, and likewise of major importance in the present study, is the question of the distribution of holdings. Of all the titles acquired through the combined efforts of the libraries, how many were held by one library only and how many were duplicated? Of those duplicated, how many were acquired by two, three, four, and all five of the libraries? In short, what is the pattern of distribution?

The most concise answer which can be given to the above question is that the duplication of titles is fairly heavy. Of the 621 books acquired by the five Chicago libraries together, 59 per cent are in two or more libraries, 31 per cent are in three or more, 13 per cent are in four or more, and 3 per cent are in all five libraries. Forty-one per cent of the books, on the other hand, are not duplicated.

Duplication in itself, of course, is not necessarily undesirable. A considerable amount of it, indeed, is probably essential, even within a small geographical area, if readers' needs are to be met promptly and effectively. But heavy duplication may prevent adequate coverage of a subject field. If a group of libraries has a limited amount of money for books in a particular field, it is logical to suppose that the larger the number of titles duplicated, the smaller will be the number of *different* titles which can be acquired. Extensive duplication and extensive coverage, in short, are not likely to go together. In an area where coverage is extensive, considerable duplication

may be admissible. But where coverage is inadequate, heavy duplication may well be regarded as an unwarranted luxury.

Closer examination of the duplicated holdings reveals the following facts:

1. English-language publications make up the bulk of the duplicated titles in all categories. Of a total of 366 books held by two or more of the libraries, 331, or 90 per cent, were published in England and the United States. No less than 238, or 65 per cent, are American publications.

2. Very few foreign-language books were duplicated. Of the 692 check-list titles published in France, Germany, and Italy, only 35, or 5 per cent, were held by two or more of the libraries. Most of the duplicated foreign-language works, moreover, were held by only two of the five libraries.

3. Duplication was much greater, proportionately, in some areas of political science than in others. It was especially heavy in JK ("Constitutional History and Administration—United States"), JX ("International Law, etc."), Group 1 ("International Relations"), Group 2 ("Political History"), Group 5 ("Political Biography"), and Group 8 ("Economic and Social Problems [Theory, History, and Present Conditions]").

4. A very large share of the holdings of each of the five libraries consisted of duplicated titles. The proportions were as follows: University of Chicago, 66 per cent; Northwestern University, 86 per cent; Chicago Public Library, 90 per cent; Newberry, 91 per cent; and John Crerar, 94 per cent. Only the University of Chicago held a fairly large number of unique titles.

5. A number of the most widely held books were received by one or more of the libraries through gift or exchange. Other were publications in series for which some of the libraries had standing orders.

While the amount of duplication seems fairly heavy in proportion to the extent of coverage in all six type categories, in only three groups—"Monographs," "Collections," and "Reference Works"—does there appear to be any opportunity of reducing the number of duplicated titles. Important books on topics of gen-

eral interest must, of course, be widely represented. Little justification can be found, however, for the heavy duplication of highly specialized works, titles used only infrequently (many foreign publications, for example), and books of secondary importance. Although the number of duplicated titles is not large in any of the six categories, it should be remembered that the check list used in this study represents only one of many subject fields and includes only certain types of material published during one year in a small group of countries. The amount of duplication revealed in this one field may appear relatively insignificant; but, considered in relation to all fields and to all available publications, duplication becomes a problem of major proportions.

On the assumption that more extensive coverage of current publications is a desirable objective, it is interesting to speculate on the extent to which coverage could be broadened simply by reducing the amount of duplication. Some indication of the possibilities involved here may be seen by considering the monographs acquired in terms of individual books or copies rather than in terms of titles. It has been mentioned above that the five Chicago libraries together acquired 219 of the 457 monographs in the check list. Of these, 100 were held by one library, 60 by two libraries, 30 by three libraries, 21 by four libraries, and 8 by all five libraries. By counting the number of times each title is represented, one finds that these 219 titles account for no less than 434 copies. This means that the libraries as a group obtained an average of about two copies of every monograph they held. To be exact, the ratio of copies to titles is 1.98:1.

If, by means of careful integration of book selection and service, the five Chicago libraries were able to reduce the

copy-title ratio from 1.98:1 to, say, 1.75:1, they would be making a substantial reduction in the amount of duplication. At this ratio, for example, they would have acquired only 383 copies of the 219 monographs held, or 51 fewer copies than they actually acquired. If, instead of these 51 duplicate copies, the libraries had purchased one copy of each of 51 new titles not already held, they would have increased their coverage from 47 per cent to 59 per cent of the total monographs in the check list. This increase, theoretically, would have been realized without any greater financial outlay than was originally required for the duplicated copies. Actual reductions in duplications could be made, of course, only after careful consideration of particular titles and of the needs of the individual libraries.

For reducing the duplication of political science materials in the Chicago area the University of Chicago, Northwestern, and Newberry must probably bear the major responsibility. These libraries are now acquiring a fairly large number of titles of all types in this field, and presumably they will continue to do so. Through careful planning of book selection they should be able to broaden the scope of their combined resources without impairing their services to their own clienteles. The Chicago Public Library should certainly take cognizance of any collaboration on the part of these three libraries, but its participation in an agreement will be limited by its responsibility to provide books of all types for circulating purposes even though they are already held by other large libraries in the community.

V. GAPS IN THE LIBRARY HOLDINGS

Under the heading of gaps or omissions in the holdings of the Chicago libraries two questions are pertinent: (1)

What kinds of books were not held by the libraries? and (2) How important are these books? In other words, how serious are the gaps in the library holdings?

The nature of the titles not acquired may be described in terms of country of publication and of subject matter. Most of them, clearly, were foreign-language publications. Of the 717 books not represented in the area, 531, or 74 per cent, were published in France, Germany, and Italy. With respect to subject, a large share of the titles were concerned with certain areas of the field to which the Chicago libraries gave relatively little emphasis. The most conspicuous areas of omission were JC ("Political Theory"), JN ("Constitutional History and Administration—Europe"), JS ("Local Government"), JV ("Colonies and Colonization"), JX ("International Law, etc."), and Group 6 ("Law—Legal and Administrative Problems"). Of a total of 595 books in these six fields, the libraries did not acquire 380, or 64 per cent.

How serious are these gaps in the library collections? The answer to this question depends upon the value of the various types of publication to library users in the Chicago area and upon the importance of the particular titles which were not acquired. Monographs, for example, are a type of material on which scholars depend heavily. Individual titles however, vary considerably in their importance. Perhaps the Chicago libraries acquired the best of the year's output of all types of publication. Even so, however, it is clear that they did not obtain all or nearly all of the interesting and worth-while titles which were available.

Book reviews and the holdings of other research libraries supply some evidence as to the importance of the titles not acquired. Judged on the basis of reviews, a large share of these books are titles of

scholarly interest. Nearly two-thirds of them received comment in one or more reviewing mediums. In so far as library holdings are a valid index of importance, an even larger share of these titles may be regarded as worth-while publications. No less than 74 per cent of the 717 books were held by at least one American scholarly library. Fifty per cent of them were held by the New York Public Library alone.¹⁹

Just how many of these 717 titles should be represented in the Chicago area it is manifestly impossible to say. Probably no group either of librarians or of political scientists would agree on this question. What seems reasonably clear, however, is that *some* valuable books of each type were not acquired. On the basis of conservative estimates it seems fair to say that the Chicago libraries should have obtained about 136 titles, or roughly 20 per cent, of the 717 books which they did not acquire.²⁰ Of these 136 titles, 60 are monographs, 12 are collected works, 15 are textbooks, 4 are general treatises, 15 are reference books, and 30 are popularizations. An arrearage of 136 important titles in one field for a single year is a substantial omission in a major library center. Similar omissions, extending over even a few years, would obviously result in very considerable gaps in the holdings of the Chicago libraries.

VI. SUMMARY

This study is concerned with the accessibility and distribution of current political science books in the large li-

¹⁹ Information about the New York Public Library's holdings was obtained by checking the catalog of the Reference Department. The holdings of other libraries were ascertained through the Library of Congress Union Catalog.

²⁰ For a list of these and other titles not acquired by the Chicago libraries see chap. viii of the complete report of this investigation.

braries of the Chicago area. It attempts to answer three broad questions: (1) To what extent did the Chicago libraries, taken as a group, acquire books published during 1937 in France, Germany, Italy, England, and the United States in the field of political science? (2) How much duplication was there among the titles which they acquired? (3) What kinds of titles were not obtained by the libraries and how serious are the gaps in their holdings?

The answers to these questions presented in this study were obtained through the use of a comprehensive check list of 1,338 political science books. This check list, consisting chiefly of publications in the regular book trade, was constructed from titles listed in the leading political science journals and national bibliographies of the five countries. Once the list was compiled, the books were classified by type or form, by country of publication, and by minor subject. By checking this list against the catalogs of the Chicago libraries, it was then possible to describe the extent and nature of the libraries' coverage, duplication, and omission in terms of each of these characteristics. For determining the importance of the titles not acquired by the libraries, two rough criteria of quality were employed: book reviews and the holdings of other American libraries. The holdings of one outstanding scholarly library—the New York Public Library—are cited for comparative purposes throughout the study.

With respect to coverage, the study shows that the Chicago libraries' acquisitions of current political science books were only moderately extensive. Of a total of 1,338 publications in the check list, the libraries acquired 46 per cent. While they obtained a large share (71 per cent) of the English-language

titles, their coverage of foreign-language works was relatively slight (23 per cent). Although their holdings were not extensive in any of the six type categories represented in the check list, the libraries gave approximately as much emphasis to textbooks (47 per cent) and to popularizations (44 per cent) as they gave to scholarly monographs (48 per cent). The extent of coverage varied considerably from one subfield of political science to another. In three areas the libraries obtained 70 per cent or more of the check-list titles, in nine areas from 40 per cent to 69 per cent, and in six areas less than 40 per cent. Fields receiving most emphasis were political biography and American government; least interest was shown in legal and administrative problems, colonies and colonization, and European government. While none of the Chicago libraries obtained a large share of the check-list titles, the University of Chicago was easily the strongest of the group and John Crerar the weakest. The former held 38 per cent and the latter 5 per cent of the total check list. Northwestern ranked second with 25 per cent, Newberry third with 15 per cent, and the Chicago Public Library fourth with 12 per cent.

In proportion to the number of titles held there was fairly heavy duplication in the combined holdings of the Chicago libraries. Of 621 books acquired, 59 per cent were held by two or more of the libraries, 31 per cent by three or more, 13 per cent by four or more, and 3 per cent by all five. Ninety per cent of the duplicated titles were published in England and the United States. Much of this duplication can be justified on the basis of individual library needs. In only three categories—"Monographs," "Collections," and "Reference Works"—does there appear to be any opportunity of

reducing the number of duplicated titles. The University of Chicago, Northwestern, and Newberry must bear the major responsibility for any future reduction of duplication in this field.

Viewed broadly in terms of the number of titles not represented in the area, the gaps in the library holdings are substantial. In all, 717 books, or 54 per cent of the check list, were not acquired by any of the libraries. Three-fourths of these books were published in France, Germany, and Italy. In so far as book reviews are a valid criterion, many of these titles are works of scholarly interest; 64 per cent of them were reviewed by one or more journals. Judged by the holdings of other libraries, an even larger number of these titles are of interest to serious readers; no less than 74 per cent of the books not held by the Chicago libraries were acquired by at least one American research library. Fifty per cent of them were obtained by the New York Public Library alone.

VII. IMPLICATIONS

Although it leaves important questions unanswered, this study shows clearly that in the field of political science the Chicago libraries' coverage of current publications is far from complete. While the libraries acquired a large share of the American and English titles and some of the more important works in foreign languages, their holdings of foreign books are relatively small and their coverage of some areas of the field is very slight, even among monographs and other scholarly types of publication. In short, it is probably fair to say that the libraries acquired many of the outstanding books needed to meet current demands, but they did not acquire a large number of less-known titles which, though not outstanding contributions to

scholarship, are necessary to support broad research and to provide reasonably full documentation in the field.

It is not easy to visualize gaps in library holdings, and it is even more difficult to estimate their long-term importance for research. This study, however, has provided a detailed description of some of the omissions in the Chicago libraries' holdings of political science books and has shown, in terms of titles not acquired, that these gaps are fairly serious. The number of books involved in this analysis, however, was small. Compared with the thousands of titles acquired by the Chicago libraries annually, the fact that they failed to obtain an estimated 136 worth-while books published in five countries during 1937 in the field of political science seems relatively insignificant.

Extended over a period of time, however, this arrearage takes on somewhat greater importance. Assuming that the Chicago libraries fail to acquire an equal number of important political science titles annually over a period of years, one can readily see that the accumulated arrearage is impressive. In five years it would amount to 680 titles, in ten years to 1,360 titles, and by the end of twenty-five years it would have reached 3,400 titles. These figures represent important books in the field of political science alone. Moreover, they are books published in only five countries—the countries from which these libraries undoubtedly obtained the largest share of their holdings in the field. The number of books published in other foreign countries which were not acquired by the Chicago libraries is probably large.

Projected to other fields, the gaps in the combined holdings of the Chicago libraries appear even more serious. The 136 important titles not acquired by the

libraries represent approximately 10 per cent of the total number of political science books published in the five countries during 1937. (This total, it will be recalled, is 1,338—the number of books in the check list.) If one assumes that the Chicago libraries' coverage of *all other* fields was about the same, on the average, as their coverage of political science, one can easily estimate the libraries' arrearage of important books published in the United States, England, France, Germany, and Italy in 1937 in all fields. Estimated conservatively, the total output of new books and new editions in these five countries during 1937 was 50,000 titles.²² If 10 per cent of this total can be taken to represent important books not acquired by the Chicago libraries, it may be said that the libraries' arrearage of books published in these five countries during 1937 in all fields amounted to approximately 5,000 titles.

An annual arrearage of 5,000 important titles is obviously one of considerable proportions.²³ Admittedly, this is a rough estimate, but it seems, on the basis of the present study, to be fairly conservative. Over a five-year period an arrearage of this magnitude would amount to 25,000 titles and in twenty-five years it would reach 125,000. This figure, it must be remembered, represents the publications of only five countries. In terms of the *world output* of current book-trade

publications, the arrearage would be considerably greater.

If these estimates have any meaning for the future, it seems fair to say that they point to the need for a larger measure of planning and co-ordination in building up the book collections of the Chicago area. This idea is by no means new, but the present study supplies fresh evidence to support it. Only by means of systematic planning and organization will it be possible for the Chicago libraries to cope successfully with the world output of current books in all fields. This study, therefore, concludes with a number of suggestions looking toward the development of a broad program of co-ordinated acquisition by the libraries of the Chicago area.²⁴

Clarification of library objectives is probably the primary requisite for a successful program of co-ordinated acquisition. Accordingly, the Chicago libraries should first formulate a clear statement of what they are trying to do. This statement of aims should apply both to the individual libraries and to the community as a whole. Each library should define its own objectives, and the libraries together should then formulate over-all objectives for the area. The latter will be based, of course, upon the needs, present and future, of the whole Chicago area, just as individual library objectives are derived from the peculiar needs of each library's clientele. In defining their broad objectives for the region, each library

²² This excludes pamphlets, musical compositions, etc. For statistics on book production during 1937 in the major countries, see *Le Droit d'auteur*, LI (1938), 137-48; LII (1939), 31-34, 37-39, 50-56.

²³ It should be emphasized that this is not the total number of books not acquired but only the arrearage of the more important or worth-while publications. The libraries' *total* arrearage in all fields, on the basis of their coverage in political science, would be about 27,000 titles of the 50,000 published during 1937 in the five countries. It is not assumed, of course, that the Chicago libraries should have acquired all these titles.

²⁴ A clear statement of the need for library planning in the Chicago area, together with an outline of the essential elements in a program of library co-operation, may be found in Joeckel and Carnovsky, *op. cit.*, chap. xv, and Carleton B. Joeckel, "A 'Little Capital' for Libraries in Chicago," *Library Quarterly*, VI (July, 1936), 221-36. The writer is indebted to both of these sources for several of the suggestions presented in this chapter. Cf. also Bibliographical Planning Committee of Philadelphia, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-50.

will be called upon to some extent to reconcile its individual aims with the larger purposes of the group.

With respect to the library objectives for the Chicago area as a whole it seems reasonable to suggest that the libraries should adopt a boldly aggressive viewpoint. The Chicago area is a large and growing center of scholarly activity. For the support of present and future research great libraries are essential. If these libraries are to be fully adequate, they must build up extensive collections of printed materials. Their resources must be sufficient to meet ordinary current demands, but they must also be able to satisfy the scholar's occasional requests for out-of-the-way material. They must acquire not only outstanding books by prominent authorities but also many works of less-known writers. In short, the combined holdings of the Chicago libraries should probably contain a large share of the world output of current books of scholarly interest in many fields. The libraries would certainly not want—nor could they ever acquire—the entire world's output of current books; but, in view of the size of the total, the acquisition of even the most important titles would be a considerable undertaking.

The formulation of objectives for the future should be accompanied by a concerted effort on the part of the Chicago libraries to describe and evaluate their existing resources. What the libraries are doing now and what they can hope to do in the future will depend very largely upon their present equipment. A comprehensive survey of local collections to determine the extent and nature of their holdings in all important fields is a major prerequisite for the development of a co-ordinated acquisition program. Such a survey should prove especially useful in revealing the presence of gaps and dupli-

cation in the combined library resources. By showing the results of past efforts at co-ordination, it would indicate the direction which future efforts should take.

After defining their objectives and taking stock of their resources, the libraries should devise appropriate methods for realizing their goals. This means, among other things, that they should extend and perfect their existing specialization agreements to the end of increasing coverage, eliminating needless duplication, and filling serious gaps in their combined holdings. The agreements already in existence are important beginnings. They should be modified, however, in at least three respects. First, they should include all important libraries in the area which recognize an obligation to serve serious readers. Agreements covering political science, for example, should take in such libraries as the Joint Reference Library of the Public Administration Clearing House, the Library of International Relations, and the library of the Chicago Law Institute, as well as the large public and university libraries represented in this study. Second, the agreements should be sufficiently detailed to serve as a guide to book selection in the minor subdivisions of broad fields. Moreover, they should be precise enough to recognize distinctions of type and country as well as those of subject matter in the literature of all fields. And, finally, the agreements should provide for the continual re-examination of book-selection policies and for the consultation on individual purchases which are necessary to keep them alive and flexible.

This last point suggests the need for some kind of central agency to oversee the planning and operation of the agreements. The initial work of setting up the program of co-ordinated acquisition

should probably be undertaken by the Chicago Metropolitan Library Council. For the oversight of the program in its day-to-day operation and for the bibliographical work incidental to the clearing of book orders, some other agency is required. It may be that a regional library information center, such as that suggested for the Chicago area by Joeckel and Carnovsky,²⁵ could discharge these functions most appropriately.

Finally, there appears to be a definite need for improved methods of selecting foreign books for Chicago libraries. Undoubtedly, one reason for the poor representation of French, German, and Italian titles in the area is the lack of prompt and reliable information about important new books published in these countries. As a solution of this problem, Waples has suggested the exchange among large libraries in various countries of critical reports on the current literature of each nation in the major subject fields or, as a more modest effort, the circulation of classified lists of the accessions of these libraries.²⁶ This scheme would make available to American libraries the expert judgment of foreign librarians on current

foreign-language titles. Such a plan appears worthy of serious consideration by the large libraries of the Chicago area in co-operation with other research libraries in this country.

In conclusion, it should be noted that co-ordinated acquisition is just one of several methods of improving library resources and service through co-operative effort. Other possibilities, such as co-operative cataloging, the development of one or more union catalogs, and the improvement of interlibrary loan services, are no less important, and they deserve careful consideration. These devices however, are all means of increasing the usefulness of existing library holdings. Specialization agreements provide the only method by which libraries can keep abreast of the present and future world output of important publications. Such agreements have already contributed much toward strengthening and diversifying the library resources of Chicago. Their further development is a *sine qua non* of a rational acquisition program for this area.

²⁶ Douglas Waples and Harold D. Lasswell, *National Libraries and Foreign Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), pp. 13-14.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 411.

